

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 94 11:01:23 PDT  
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #662  
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest                      Tue, 14 Jun 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    662

Today's Topics:

                                      "73's"  
                                      1750-meter info?  
                                      AEA IsoLoop - Opinions/Experiences  
                                      Anyone know K1RX?  
                                      Com'l License Exams & Adv. Cl. Lic.  
                                      How long do NJ ham plates take????  
                                      JPOLE.EXE calculates measurements of antenna for desired freq v1.1  
                                      Nickel Hydride Cells  
                                      Poor Man's UHF Transmitter Combiner?  
                                      TH-78A Peculiarities <--Help Wanted

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Tue, 14 Jun 1994 10:40:13 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!utnut!torn!nott!cunews!  
freenet.carleton.ca!FreeNet.Carleton.CA!as041@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: "73's"  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In a previous article, Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.CH.INTel.COM (Cecil A Moore) says:

>Hey Mike, you need to get out of the shack more often. Before there  
>was such a thing as ham radio, 73 was (and is) an English figure and  
>should follow the rules of the English language, e.g. I can't believe  
>the number of 73's that I have seen lately on info-hams. Try composing  
>the preceeding sentence without pluralizing 73. :-)

AAAAAAAAAAAA

Well, it is not too difficult...just pluralize it, do not apostrophize it. In your context it is a plural, not a possessive.

If you want to say: <There were a lot of 73s being bandied around>, then add the <s>. There is absolutely no reason for the apostrophe. It is not possessive (singular or plural), and it is not a contraction.

--

Robin Ludlow, VE3YE  
Orleans, Ontario, Canada  
as041@freenet.carleton.ca

-----

Date: 14 Jun 1994 15:24:59 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!mustang.mst6.lanl.gov!newshost.lanl.gov!  
Chris.Pearcy@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 1750-meter info?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does anyone have info on the "no-license-required" 1750-meter band (160-190 kHz) or the Panaxis CW transceiver kit for that band? Are there many hobbyists on the band? Thanks.

-----

Date: 14 Jun 94 17:16:17 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: AEA IsoLoop - Opinions/Experiences  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Anyone out there using (or familiar with someone who uses) the AEA IsoLoop antenna? It's kind of caught my fancy as a reasonable alternative to a full-sized beam. Is it the urban dweller's answer to casual QSOs in the 10-30MHz world?

Kindly address replies to: baffer@pnet01.cts.com

73 es tn timer - Ron Bafetti, KH6HKK, San Diego, CA

-----

Date: 14 Jun 94 14:08:22 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Anyone know K1RX?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I sent a QSL and SASE to him, but the post office returned it "forwarding time expired." If anyone knows Mark, could they email his new address to me? Thanks and 73  
Mike N6MZ mikemr@microsoft.com

-----  
Date: 14 Jun 1994 14:33:15 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!bloom-beacon.mit.edu!senator-bedfellow.mit.edu!w1gsl@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Com'l License Exams & Adv. Cl. Lic.  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun14.014949.20260@nuchat.sccsi.com> acs@news.sccsi.com  
(A.C. Spraggins) writes:

>  
>Does anyone know of a site where I can download the FCC question pool for  
>the commercial license exams? I understand that about 80 percent of the  
>quiz comes from the pool of the Advanced class study material. The pool  
>changes next month and I would like to take the test over the old questions.  
>

I know of no "on line" source for the commercial exam Q pool. As one of W5YI's commercial examiners I can also tell you the pool does not change next month. The only question pool that changes in July 1994 is the amateur general class exam.

What does happen next month is that the FCC is proposing adding an additional regulatory fee, last I heard it would add \$105 to the cost of getting a GROL license.

To avoid the additional fee all of your paper work must reach the FCC before July. The MIT Radio Exam Team and several other National Radio Examiners groups will be offering a "last chance" exam on Saturday June 18th.

As far as study material for the MROP or the GROL, W5YI and Gordon West have just published a real text book based on the current pool. It is available from Radio Shack for about \$12. I highly recommend it.

The Q pools are still the best available study material for the Global Maritime Distress and Safety Systems licenses. Copies are available for sale from W5YI.

73 Steve F  
W1GSL



--

```
*****
jwittich@bnr.ca          * BNR claims they know nothing of my
AC4Z0                   * employment here.
*****
```

-----

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 94 10:53:52 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!pipex!uknet!uos-ee!ee.surrey.ac.uk!  
M.Willis@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Nickel Hydride Cells  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <brett\_miller.308.0011852E@ccm.hf.intel.com>,  
brett\_miller@ccm.hf.intel.com (Brett Miller - N70LQ) writes:  
|> In article <1994Jun13.083636.5538@ee.surrey.ac.uk> M.Willis@ee.surrey.ac.uk  
(Mike Willis) writes:  
|> >I have just bought 6 Nickel Hydride AA cells for use with my Icom handheld. I  
|> >wonder if anyone has any experience with such cells they are able to share?  
The  
|> >cells are marked as 1.2V 1200mA hours. They weigh about the same as Nicads but  
|>  
|> I had some 1000mAH Gold Peak cells I used in My Icom 2SRA for  
|> a few months about a two years ago. They discharged very quickly and soon  
|> seemed like they wouldn't hold a charge. I used the Icom 60-70mA charger and  
|> charged them for about 16 hours. I was very careful when I charged them, but  
|> it didn't seem to make a difference. I was told by someone that early NMH  
|> cells had a lot of problems (especially Gold Peak).

I think they might be gold peak, never heard of them before but the GP is  
suspicious. However regarding your own cells and the ICOM charger, you need to  
charge them at C/10 for 14 hours. In your case this would be 100mA for 14 hours.  
However you probably charged them at 60mA for 16 hours. This is not enough, it is  
only to 70% capacity so they would be a little low. Also I haer they completely  
self discharge in a week, so I suppose it is best to keep them on float at low  
current, say 10mA until required. I charged mine at 60-70mA with the icom charger  
for 28 hours. I wonder if it is easy to modify the ICOM rigs to charge at a higher  
rate? I was not using the wall charger, I used a 12V PSU so the extra current  
would  
not be a problem. With the W2, charge current is controlled by the rig.

Mike

-----

Date: Mon, 13 Jun 1994 19:02:19 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!  
osceola.cs.ucf.edu!fang!ulysses!lznj!lznj2!ncrhub2!ranger!cn2935.DaytonOH.NCR.COM!  
jra@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Poor Man's UHF Transmitter Combiner?  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm looking for a cheap way to combine two UHF repeaters onto a single  
duplexer and antenna system. We can't afford to buy a hybrid  
combiner/isolator system, so this is going to be homebrew city.

Assuming that we can put the new repeater on a channel close enough to be  
within the duplexer's passband, we need to come up with a way to inexpensively  
combine two 35 watt UHF transmitters.

I think we can come up with several isolators, since UHF Micors have ferrite  
isolators in the T/R switch and there are lots of dead ones floating  
around. Our current thinking is along the lines of using two isolators in  
series on each transmitter, which should give, what, 40 or 50 dB of isolation?  
And the Micor isolators have a 50 watt or so dummy load on the reverse port,  
so I hope they can handle the power.

Then, a Wilkinson combiner made out of quarter wave sections and a 100 ohm  
noninductive resistor would provide some additional isolation and provide an  
impedance match into the duplexer.

The transmitters will be 35 watt Mitreks, and we can afford to lose 3dB in  
the resistors if we have to. The important things are a) not to fry the  
transmitters, and b) not to generate intermod.

Does this seem like a sensible approach? Is there any other way to do this?  
Our budget could handle a couple of hundred bucks, but unless we can find a  
very cheap used combiner, it doesn't look like the commercial solutions are  
possible for us.

Thanks for any thoughts on this...

John AG9V  
jra@lawdept.daytonOH.ncr.com

-----  
Date: Tue, 14 Jun 94 08:09:21 -0500  
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: TH-78A Peculiarities <--Help Wanted  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Marc Richard Wollemborg <mrw13@namaste.cc.columbia.edu> writes:

>One other small thing. About half the time, the tx doesn't always open up  
>immediately on the commercial band. The red light will flash on and the

Well marc,  
the obvious suggestion is dont tx out of band!!!!

-----

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 1994 12:59:01 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!halsoft.com!netcomsv!  
netcom.com!rogjd@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2t9u1d\$3n9@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <rogjdCr7tnH.ByI@netcom.com>,  
<2ti5fs\$j07@nyx10.cs.du.edu>  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Jay Maynard (jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu) wrote:  
: In article <rogjdCr7tnH.ByI@netcom.com>,  
: Roger Buffington <rogjd@netcom.com> wrote:  
: >Jay, if your asinine rhetoric of calling me a communist weren't so darned  
: >funny, I'd probably be pissed at you. Why don't you invest in a  
: >dictionary or a good thesaurus, and see if you can't find a better  
: >adjective. I am just old enough to resent twerps who carelessly call  
: >honest folks communists.

Snip! Long windy, whiny paragraph removed for the good of all....

: I've been involved in ham radio, including several repeater groups, for over  
: 20 years. I've put more into repeaters and repeater clubs and frequency  
: coordination than you've put into radios. I've served the hams of Texas in  
: various capacities for almost 10 years...how long have you been in ham radio?

28 years Jay. 28 years. You certainly seem to have a high opinion of  
yourself, I'll grant you that. As far as whether you've put more into  
serving amateur radio than I have, highly debatable and perhaps not the  
subject of this thread.

For the record, your 10 years is a little over a third of the length of  
the service to and membership in the hobby.

I've found that people who blow a lot of stack gas about how much they do  
for the hobby, how long they've been in it (as though that somehow means  
they are better ops than some of the FB newcomers to our hobby) usually  
are mostly hot air. Your puffed up rhetoric is a prime example of this

sort of braggadacio. The rest of us are not impressed.

Mostly on this thread you've alternated between name calling, attacking other people's dedication to the hobby, and then whining about all the money you've put into the hobby, all the service, etc. Stop whining! It's a hobby!

: If you want to put up and support open repeaters, great. I've been there before. I think there's a need for open repeaters...but where we differ is that I think there's a place for closed machines, too.

Well, that's your privilege. It's mine, along with a lot of other people, to disagree with you.

We probably wouldn't disagree if the situation here weren't so out of hand. I personally would entertain having a number of closed repeaters if the reason could be justify and the number was limited so as not to crowd out the possibility of large number of open repeaters. Operating a repeater, like operating any other station, is a \*\*\*privilege\*\*\* not a right. Do closed repeaters have a place? Perhaps. But not to the exclusion of all others as is presently the case here in Southern California. That was the topic of this thread, Jay. All of your whining about how this point of view would take away your repeater and how it fails to take into account your wonderful 10 years of service to the hobby, etc. etc. is simply off the topic.

: The only folks who want to outlaw closed repeaters - for that's essentially what you're calling for - are those who want someone else to make their radios useful. If you think that that places me on a high horse, all I can say is come up here and enjoy the view.

See, here's a good example of how you argue. No one except {insert name-calling or innuendo here} would disagree with Jay.

Jay, believe it or not, some of us like to conduct a discussion without name-calling and putting the other fellow down. Your approach of attacking your opponent rather than his argument belies your oft-repeated claim of how much service to the hobby you've put in. In radio clubs and in real life few people want to work with or be around people who behave in this fashion.

: >Please answer concisely. These 5 or 6 page answers you've been posting  
: >have given my "kill" function enhanced utility.

: You are, of course, entitled to read what you'd like. This issue, however, is not one that lends itself to concise answers; it's a knotty, complex, political one that's been going on for longer than you've even known about ham



: radio. I've been writing as concisely as I can while still addressing the  
: issues. It's just not as black-and-white as you'd like to believe.  
: --

Since we've established that I've been in amateur radio a heck of a lot  
longer than you, the first part of the above paragraph is exposed as being  
wrong (as well as snotty). As for your condescending, unpleasant diatribe  
about the complexity, well, thank you for the insight. But please,  
concision.

--

rogjd@netcom.com  
Glendale, CA  
AB6WR

-----  
Date: Tue, 14 Jun 1994 13:02:53 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!  
news.hal.COM!halsoft.com!netcomsv!netcom.com!rogjd@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <Cr9Kyq.EwG@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <rogjdCrAGJB.CAK@netcom.com>,  
<CrBrv2.Fv2@news.Hawaii.Edu>v  
Subject : Re: End of '440 in SoCal' thread (was: VHF Maritime Outrage!!)

Jeffrey Herman (jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu) wrote:  
: In article <rogjdCrAGJB.CAK@netcom.com> rogjd@netcom.com (Roger Buffington)  
writes:

: >  
: >Say, Jeff, if you are such a technical stud and CW whiz, why don't you  
: >upgrade to Extra Class?

: I wish I was a 'technical stud' - then I wouldn't have to spend weeks  
: trouble shooting these QRPP xmtrs - getting the bugs out is just as  
: much fun as operating them, though.

For some of us. Personally, I am not much for troubleshooting radios. I  
like to operate 'em though. Where do you find the time?

: I'll upgrade to at least advanced either as soon as I finish this Ph.D.  
: or they kick me out of grad school - I've used up 3 years and haven't  
: done very much..... only 4 years remaining to get everything done. Phooey.

I start law school in the fall. Guess we'll both be out of the workforce  
for awhile?

Less time to do Internet, alas....

Have fun with the tests. I studied 3 nights for the extra. With my non-technical background (I'm a CPA by trade; don't know a lot of electronics) if I can do it, anyone can.

73

--

rogjd@netcom.com  
Glendale, CA  
AB6WR

-----

Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
Mine took 13 weeks, exactly.

--

Al Schwarz ND2K  
(908) 949-3890  
cbnewsh!nd2k

-----

Date: 14 Jun 1994 08:30:12 -0600  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!  
mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCr7tnH.ByI@netcom.com>, <2ti5fs\$j07@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,  
<rogjdCrE1ED.1IE@netcom.com>-mail  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <rogjdCrE1ED.1IE@netcom.com>,  
Roger Buffington <rogjd@netcom.com> wrote:  
>Jay Maynard (jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu) wrote:  
>: In article <rogjdCr7tnH.ByI@netcom.com>,  
>: Roger Buffington <rogjd@netcom.com> wrote:  
>: >Jay, if your asinine rhetoric of calling me a communist weren't so darned  
>: >funny, I'd probably be pissed at you. Why don't you invest in a  
>: >dictionary or a good thesaurus, and see if you can't find a better  
>: >adjective. I am just old enough to resent twerps who carelessly call  
>: >honest folks communists.  
>Snip! Long windy, whiny paragraph removed for the good of all....

...that explains why I think he really is a repeater communist.  
Nice debating tactic there. Who's calling who names? Why not answer the argument instead, as you keep claiming I should do?

>: I've been involved in ham radio, including several repeater groups, for over  
>: 20 years. I've put more into repeaters and repeater clubs and frequency  
>: coordination than you've put into radios. I've served the hams of Texas in  
>: various capacities for almost 10 years...how long have you been in ham radio?  
>28 years Jay. 28 years.

[pulls out first license] OK, fine. You have 5 years on me.

> You certainly seem to have a high opinion of  
>yourself, I'll grant you that. As far as whether you've put more into  
>serving amateur radio than I have, highly debatable and perhaps not the  
>subject of this thread.

>For the record, your 10 years is a little over a third of the length of  
>the service to and membership in the hobby.

That's just the hams of Texas as a whole, with the Texas VHF-FM Society. That doesn't include quite a bit of service locally with various repeater clubs. Even so, I'll buy that you've been around the service, and serving ham radio as a whole, for quite a while. Your uninformed arguments led me to believe otherwise.

>I've found that people who blow a lot of stack gas about how much they do  
>for the hobby, how long they've been in it (as though that somehow means  
>they are better ops than some of the FB newcomers to our hobby) usually  
>are mostly hot air. Your puffed up rhetoric is a prime example of this  
>sort of braggadacio. The rest of us are not impressed.

I can't control that...but the fact remains that I speak about the practicalities of coordination from personal experience. Do you?

>Mostly on this thread you've alternated between name calling, attacking  
>other people's dedication to the hobby, and then whining about all the  
>money you've put into the hobby, all the service, etc. Stop whining!  
>It's a hobby!

I can throw that one right back at those who whine about not being able to put up an open repeater on 440. Quit whining! Pick another band!

>Well, that's your privilege. It's mine, along with a lot of other  
>people, to disagree with you.

I don't argue that. Everyone has the right to be wrong. :-)

When you start advocating that coordinators do patently stupid things that will get them sued into oblivion, though, I have to stand up and yell, "HELL NO!"

>We probably wouldn't disagree if the situation here weren't so out of  
>hand. I personally would entertain having a number of closed repeaters if  
>the reason could be justify and the number was limited so as not to crowd  
>out the possibility of large number of open repeaters. Operating a  
>repeater, like operating any other station, is a \*\*\*privilege\*\*\* not a  
>right. Do closed repeaters have a place? Perhaps. But not to the  
>exclusion of all others as is presently the case here in Southern  
>California. That was the topic of this thread, Jay. All of your whining  
>about how this point of view would take away your repeater and  
>how it fails to take into account your wonderful 10 years of service to  
>the hobby, etc. etc. is simply off the topic.

No, it's right on topic. Operaring a repeater is a privilege that can only be revoked by the FCC. As a coordinator, I can't tell you not to put up a repeater.

There's simply no way to outlaw, or restrict, closed repeaters in a way that won't get coordinators sued. There's certainly no way to \_remove\_ existing closed repeaters.

My experience with the coordination process gives me the real-world experience to back up my statements. As such, it's relevant.

>Jay, believe it or not, some of us like to conduct a discussion without  
>name-calling and putting the other fellow down. Your approach of  
>attacking your opponent rather than his argument belies your oft-repeated  
>claim of how much service to the hobby you've put in. In radio clubs and  
>in real life few people want to work with or be around people who behave  
>in this fashion.

Fine. Let me know when you want to conduct a discussion in that fashion. You're certainly not doing it now. In the meantime, I'll simply point out that there are others in this group - and in this discussion - that can back up my word.

>Since we've established that I've been in amateur radio a heck of a lot  
>longer than you, the first part of the above paragraph is exposed as being  
>wrong (as well as snotty). As for your condescending, unpleasent diatribe  
>about the complexity, well, thank you for the insight. But please,  
>concision.

I'll concede the issue of how long you've been in ham radio. That makes it all the more surprising that you still believe it's a black-and-white issue; the

longer I'm involved with it, the more complex it gets. I'm being as concise as I can while still arguing the whole issue.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.  
To Sarah Brady, Howard Metzenbaum, Dianne Feinstein, and Charles Schumer:  
Thanks. Without you, I would be neither a gun owner nor an NRA life member.

-----

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #662

\*\*\*\*\*